kind, suited to that form of plan which may appear to be the most convenient for the occasion. To show that something else besides form is involved, instances might be quoted of buildings identical in principle in this respect, but the very opposites of each other as to hearing.

In the human ear, the tympanum is circular, and the fibres are of equal length, radiating from the centre to the circumference. Sir E. Home considers that it is this equality of the radii which adapts it to musical sounds: he found that the tympanum of the elephant was oval, the fibres varying in length like the radii of an ellipse, and he is of opinion that the long fibres enable the animal to hear very minute sounds, which it is known to do; on a pianoforte being played upon in the hearing of the elephant at Exeter-change, it was found that while the higher tones hardly attracted the animal's notice, the low ones roused his attention: in the great lion the higher tones excited great attention, but the flat ones were no sooner sounded than he lashed himself into the most frightful fury. Sir E. Home found this inequality of the fibres of the tympanum in neat-cattle, the horse, deer, hare, and cat. Buffon made many trials on persons who heard better with one ear than with the other, and who from that cause had what is called a bad ear for music, and he always found that the defect proceeded from their having unequal ears, and receiving thereby at the same time unequal sensations; such persons hearing false, also, without knowing it, sung false. There is here surely some excuse for "the man who hath not music in his soul!"*

THE RESTORATION QUESTION.

Our forefathers, for the last two centuries, spoilt for us many beautiful churches, the work of the middle ages, but they did it honestly. They said they were ugly—the remains of a barbarous age—and only used them (where they had the means) as a groundwork for classical erections of various kinds; but as they did not understand or care for the old work—in fact, took no notice of it, except where it came in the way of their own productions in other parts,—they left it just as it was. Thus in almost every church, even in the towns, where the "improvement and beautifying" of churches was carried on to a great extent, and all kinds of beauties and deformities, of Egyptian, Indian, Grecian, Venetian, and Palladian styles, were thrust in regardless of cost, still there were left extensive remains of the veritable work of the first builders; not only the masonry of the walls and external mouldings unimpaired except by the gradual action of the weather, but even hosts of beautiful, delicate ornaments within, carved in stone or wood, or painted on the walls or roof, or on wooden panels. These were, indeed, often removed from their right places, and put to some absurd use, or hid in some corner, where only the searching eye of the antiquary has been able to find them; but still there they were, the real, actual work of the builders and painters of the mediæval times,—not destroyed, because they were not thought worth destroying.

And so, when we began again to understand and value these masterpieces of Christian art, there was hardly a single church where the student could not see the real, genuine works of the old builders, and read their spirit in them.

But, alas, experience has shown the truth of the accusation, that "Englishmen see with their fingers." From admiring, they passed to tracing and copying, and then to collecting specimens,—in plain words, stealing wood and stone, and much more frequently more valuable fragments of brass and glass.

But the method which has been adopted by the same class of people for the last few years, and which is now in the height of its flourish, is one certainly less palpably dishonest, inasmuch as it is done with the sanction and assistance of the guardians of the buildings, although, for my part, I do not see that it is a bit less unjust, either to past or future generations; but however this may be, one thing is certain, that it is by far more destructive to the buildings themselves.

* To be continued.

Let us carefully examine the process. The object of the Ecclesiologists of the present day, when they have got hold of an old church, is to restore it.

Why, the very name of restoration is absurd. If a thing is removed or put to a wrong use or lost, you can restore it again when it is found.

If this has happened to the church in question—if it has been moved away from its place, or turned into a barn, or heaped over with ruins or the sea-sand, it can be restored; but this is not the case, at least in 99 out of every 100.

The building is just where it always was; it has never been anything else but a church, and every Sunday hundreds of people have worshipped in it. But it will be said in answer, "What we mean is to restore to the church all that has been lost of the original buildings and decorations."

By all means do it if you can—only find them first. Let us begin with the outside. For instance, in the year 1480 we will suppose the spire which rose 100 feet above the tower, after being carelessly left in bad repair, fell down one stormy night; the roof of the church, which it broke through, was soon after repaired, but the spire never replaced. Now, then, find that and restore it to its place. If it is not to be found entire hid in some neighbouring wood, or buried in the churchyard, or locked up in the church chest, then look for the parts of it; perhaps you will find its beautiful little windows somewhere in the church, or, at any rate, the stones built into the walls of the neighbouring mansion, or the church itself. Let us put them together again. Alas! it is hopeless; the spire is utterly lost, no human power can raise it again.

However, here is another task; let us see whether it will be easier. In the parish register we read the following entry (no matter about the old spelling):—"On candelmass day, in the year of grace 1379, Domina Alice Lenton did, for the love she had to our Lady, cause one image of her to be carved in Normandy stone, and set in a niche over the porch."

Let us see what there is left now. Certainly there is the niche, looking more like a hollow in an old decayed tree; but never mind that; where is the image? There seems to be something, an upright rounded lump of stone in the niche, and now that we fix our eyes upon it, it may very likely be the remains of an image. However, as the day is cloudy and there happen to be two or three swallows' nests which rather impede observation, let us get a ladder and make a close inspection.

Yes; now we see the figure indeed, and though worn considerably away, still there is beauty enough left to tell what love Mistress Alice Lenton had to our Lady. However, the whole of the front part of the figure is sadly decayed; time and the weather, air and rain, have eaten away nearly an inch in thickness from this part: look at the face,—the eyes still show, at least the outer edge of each eye in the shade of the hair which falls in slightly waving lines still so perfect; but the nose is worn to a slight ridge which can scarcely be felt with the hand, while the mouth and chin have quite disappeared. It is just the same with the front part of that robe which hangs in straight, sober folds, and hides the feet; it is quite gone.

Now, let us restore this that is gone—let us search for the lost parts—look in the dust and earth underneath—we may find some crumbled remains.

Oh, foolish thought! no one would entertain it for a moment; they are carried away, the winds know where; turned to earth, and who knows what beside. No human hand can ever restore them. By the help of what still remains, in the more protected parts of the figure, the *imagination* can restore them, and has done so a thousand times, and has even fixed a living expression on the smooth stone; but the hand can never do it. We might carry on the same ideas with regard to the inside. There may be, perhaps, five or six old benches with carved ends, high poppy heads, or else simply low square ends cut with trefoils or coats of arms; or there may be some few squares of encaustic tiles, or some elaborately carved stone sedilia in the chancel. Why should we destroy these or destroy the work on them by carving it over again? They suggest such pleasing thoughts to us, and interest us so much, let us leave them still for those that shall come after. A restorer would take them away and supply their place with new ones done exactly after the old pattern: but, then, all the interest of them is gone.

But it may be said, "They are in such an unsound ruinous state as not to be fit for use." Well, supposing they are never required to be used now, as is the case with the sedilia in most country churches, surely this is no matter: leave them there unburt till they fall to pieces, unless you can preserve them any other way without injury. Or if they are in constant use as the benches, surely in most cases they may be made firm and sound, by iron bands or props, which will not be seen, or at least will not disfigure them much; and of course if it has come to the worst, and they are quite rotten or broken past preserving, then let them be thrown away, their day is past, and let their place be supplied by new ones. Make them of what pattern you like, the most beautiful and suitable you can, only do not call it restoring the old: be honest, and acknowledge that it is a new piece of work. If then it be asked, "What are we to do to our churches?" I would say, "Better do nothing than too much." However there is plenty to be done. Clear away all the rubbish of the two last centuries; no matter whether it be meant for use or ornament, or whether it be the dust and dirt of careless neglect, it is all equally ugly and unsuitable: only do it carefully, for fear of injuring any old work beneath: then substitute for all this the best you can now put. No amount of modesty can hide from us the fact, that some church architects and decorators (not all) have already surpassed all the excellence of those times.*

SERVATOR.

DISFIGUREMENT OF LONDON-BRIDGE.

Laudable zeal is being shown for the restoration of works of merit executed in bygone days, but let us not fail to be equally zealous in preserving the works of our own age from injury. No one can view London-bridge but must admit that it is a work of noble grandeur. It is with regard to the building recently erected, and not yet finished, on the Southwark side, that I call attention. The most casual observers cry shame, to see a building thus intruded upon that magnificent structure. Upon inspection it will be seen that the neighbouring buildings, viz., Fishmongers' Hall, the Adelaide Tavern, and Fenning's Wharf, have been reared at a judicious distance, so as not materially to injure the general effect of this bridge. So much do I deprecate it, that I can only say: If a subscription be set on foot for its removal, I will most willingly subscribe my mite, and have no doubt that many others will do the same. I will give you a simple rule of three sum if, as it has been suggested, Mr. Barry should be hanged for what he has done at the Westminster Palace—what sort of punishment do the parties concerned on London-bridge deserve?

A CITIZEN.

IRON ROOFS, NEW BAZAAR AT CORK.

Mr. Editor,—As a *pendant* to another picture, I offer you a sample of insane ironfounders, in the following tenders delivered to the Corporation of Cork for erecting wrought-iron roofs to the New Bazaar. Mr. Alexander Deane, architect:—

Beale, Scott, and Co., Cork	£3,000
Fox, Henderson, and Co., London	2,600
Paul, McSwiney, and Co., Cork	2,280
Perrott and Sons, Cork	2,000
Mallet and Co., Dublin	1,220

This, as we say in Ireland, "Bangs Banagher;" but mark the sequel: Mr. Mallet's tender having been accepted, he is called upon to perfect his securities and proceed with his contract: hereupon he writes to the Market Committee a letter, in which the plea of a mistake is urged in the thickness of glass, though the specification is quite clear, and he offers the Market Committee to go on with the contract if they allow him to use 1-8th glass instead of 3-16ths, and also advance him 90*l*., which arrangement has been agreed to, much to the dissatisfaction of the other competitors.

R.

* Although we dissent from the tendency of these remarks, we have given the communication a place, as likely to afford a useful check to some would-be restorers falling away into destructives.

To learn more about OCR and PDF Compression visit ThePaperlessOffice.org